

Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Dirac Energy

Victor Ivrii

February 1, 2008

Abstract

I derive sharp semiclassical asymptotics of $\int |e_h(x, y, 0)|^2 \omega(x, y) dx dy$ where $e_h(x, y, \tau)$ is the Schwartz kernel of the spectral projector and $\omega(x, y)$ is singular as $x = y$. I also consider asymptotics of more general expressions.

0 Introduction

In the series of papers [IS, Ivr2, Ivr3, Ivr4] devoted to the Sharp Asymptotics of the Ground State Energy of Heavy Atoms and Molecules it was needed to calculate *Dirac Correction Term*¹⁾ which in that approximation was equal to

$$(0.1) \quad I = \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \iint |e(x, y, \tau)|^2 |x - y|^{-1} dx dy$$

where $e(x, y, \tau)$ is the Schwartz kernel of the spectral projector $E(\tau)$ of the (magnetic) Schrödinger operator

$$(0.2) \quad A = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j,k} P_j g^{jk}(x) P_k - V \right), \quad P_j = hD_j - \mu V_j$$

$\tau \approx 0$ and $h \rightarrow +0$ (while either $\mu \rightarrow +\infty$ or remains constant). Actually the corresponding part of these papers was originally more complicated but it was reduced to the problem above.

¹⁾ Representing Coulomb interaction of electrons with themselves which should not to be counted in the energy calculation and should be subtracted from the Thomas-Fermi expression.

Then $l \asymp h^{-d-1}$ where d is the dimension ($d = 3$ in the above papers) and it was needed to prove that $l = \mathcal{I} + O(h^{-d-1+\delta})$ with \mathcal{I} defined by the same formula but with $e(x, y, \tau)$ replaced by

$$(0.3) \quad e_y^W(x, y, \tau) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{g(y, \xi) \leq V(y) + 2\tau} e^{ih^{-1}\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} d\xi$$

and with a small exponent $\delta > 0$; for Magnetic Schrödinger it was needed to prove as $\mu \leq h^{-\delta}$ only. Expression (0.3) is a *Weyl expression* for $e(x, y, \tau)$ for operator with coefficients frozen at point y .

However I believe that the asymptotics of expression (0.1) or more general one is interesting by itself and that there are a sharp asymptotics. Still my attempts to derive it were not very successful and in [Ivr6] I made some claims which I could not sustain at that time. So in this paper I just want to bring some degree of the order to this matter.

I am going to consider a matrix h -differential operator $A(x, hD)$ and find asymptotics of

$$(0.4) \quad l \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \iint \omega(x, y) e(x, y, \tau) \psi_2(x) e(y, x, \tau) \psi_1(y) dx dy$$

with a matrix-valued function $\omega(x, y)$ such that

$$(0.5) \quad \omega(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega(x, y; x - y) \text{ where function } \Omega \text{ is smooth in } B(0, 1) \times B(0, 1) \times B(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus 0) \text{ and homogeneous of degree } -\kappa \text{ (} 0 < \kappa < d \text{) with respect to its third argument}^2)$$

and with smooth cut-off functions ψ_1, ψ_2 .

The main part of asymptotics should have a magnitude of $h^{-d-\kappa}$ and I would like to get a remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

One can also consider a more general expression

$$(0.6) \quad l_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \iint \omega(x^1, \dots, x^m) e(x^1, x^2, \tau) \psi_2(x^1) e(x^2, x^3, \tau) \cdots e(x^m, x^1, \tau) \psi_{m+1}(x^0) \times dx^1 \cdots dx^m$$

with $x^{m+1} = x^1$, $\psi_{m+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_1$ etc and

$$(0.7) \quad \omega(x^1, \dots, x^m) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega(x^1, \dots, x^m; \{x^j - x^{j+1}\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}) \text{ where function } \Omega \text{ is smooth in } B(0, 1)^m \times B(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus 0)^{m-1} \text{ and homogeneous of degree } -(m-1)\kappa \text{ with respect to } \{x^j - x^k\}_{1 \leq j < k \leq m}. \text{ Moreover,}$$

$$|D_z^\nu D_x^\kappa \Omega| \leq C_{\nu, \kappa} |z^1|^{-\kappa - |\beta^1|} \cdots |z^m|^{-\kappa - |\beta^m|} \quad \text{as } \sum_k |z^k|^2 = 1, \sum_k z^k = 0$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^m)$, $\mathbf{z} = (z^1, \dots, z^m)$, etc.

²⁾ In other words it is Michlin-Calderon-Zygmund kernel.

However I will leave it for another paper since not of all my arguments I was able to implement in this case.

The main part of asymptotics should have a magnitude of $h^{-d-(m-1)\kappa}$ (see Theorem 1.6) and I would like to get a remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-(m-1)\kappa})$.

I am also leaving for another paper the similar but much more delicate and difficult analysis for a 2-dimensional Magnetic Schrödinger operator(0.2) with the trajectories having many loops.

Remark 0.1. (i) To avoid the necessity to cut-off with respect to hD one needs to assume that its symbol satisfies

$$(0.8) \quad |a(x, \xi)|^{-1} \leq C|\xi|^{-m} \quad \text{as } |\xi| \geq C_0$$

as $a \in \Psi^m$ (one can weaken this condition but I leave it to the reader);

(ii) One needs to assume that a is semibounded from below which under (0.8) is equivalent to

$$(0.9) \quad \langle a(x, \xi)v, v \rangle \geq c^{-1}|v|^2 \quad \text{as } |\xi| \geq C_0;$$

otherwise instead of $E(\tau)$ one should consider $E(\tau_1, \tau_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E(\tau_2) - E(\tau_1)$; I leave it to the reader as well.

This paper consist of two sections: in section 1 I derive asymptotics with the sharp remainder estimate but with the implicit Tauberian approximation for $e(x, y, 0)$. In section 2 is I replace it by expression (0.3) without deteriorating remainder estimate for scalar operators under mild non-degeneracy condition (theorem 2.19) and for certain matrix operators (theorem 2.20(i)) and with some not sharp remainder estimates for other matrix operators (theorem 2.20(ii)). I just mention that for larger κ we need less restrictive conditions to operator.

1 Estimates

1.1 Special case

Let us assume first that $\omega = 1$ but relax conditions to ψ_1, \dots, ψ_m , assuming only that $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m \in L^\infty$. This is definitely not the case I am interested in but one needs to make few clarifications first. Then

$$(1.1) \quad I_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr } E(\tau)\psi_2 E(\tau)\psi_3 E(\tau) \cdots E(\tau)\psi_{m+1}$$

containing m factors $E(\tau)$.

Under condition (0.9) it is known (see f.e. [Ivr1]) that if L^∞ norms and the diameters of supports ψ, ψ_1 are bounded, then

$$(1.2) \quad \|\psi E(\tau) \psi_1\|_1 \leq Ch^{-d} \quad \text{as } |\tau| \leq c$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ denote operator and trace norms respectively. Then since an operator norm of $E(\tau)$ does not exceed 1 I conclude that $|I_m| \leq ch^{-d}$. So

$$(1.3) \quad \text{If } \psi_j \in L^\infty \text{ and } I_m \text{ is given by (1.1) then } |I_m| \leq Ch^{-d}.$$

Further, let us assume that

$$(1.4) \quad a(x, \xi) \text{ is microhyperbolic on energy level } 0.$$

Then as (1.4) is fulfilled on supports of ψ, ψ_1 it is known (see f.e. [Ivr1]) that

$$(1.5) \quad \|\psi(E(\tau) - E(\tau'))\psi_1\| \leq C(|\tau - \tau'| + hT^{-1})h^{-d} \quad \text{as } |\tau| \leq \epsilon_1, |\tau'| \leq c.$$

Here and for a while $T \asymp 1$ but I want to keep a track of it.

Since this property holds under wider assumptions than microhyperbolicity, I will assume so far only that (1.5) holds.

Then

$$(1.6) \quad |\text{Tr}'((E(\tau) - E(\tau'))\psi_2 E(\tau_2)\psi_3 E(\tau_3) \cdots E(\tau_m)\psi_{m+1})|$$

also does not exceed the right hand expression of (1.5) as $|\tau| \leq \epsilon_1$ and therefore due to the standard Tauberian arguments (second part, see f.e. [Ivr1]) the following inequality holds:

$$(1.7) \quad |\text{Tr}'\left(\left(E(0) - h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_T(t)U(t)) d\tau\right)\psi_2 E(\tau_2)\psi_3 E(\tau_3) \cdots E(\tau_m)\psi_{m+1}\right)| \leq CT^{-1}h^{1-d}$$

where I use my standard notations $\bar{\chi}$ and χ in the future and $\bar{\chi}(t) = \bar{\chi}(t/T)$ etc (see f.e. [BrIvr]). Here and below Tr' is the ‘‘scalar trace’’ of the operator, and does not include taking matrix trace tr .

Here and below $U(t) = e^{ih^{-1}tA}$ is the propagator of A and $u(x, y, t)$ is its Schwartz' kernel.

So with $O(T^{-1}h^{1-d})$ error one could replace one copy of $E(0)$ in I_m by its standard implicit Tauberian approximation

$$(1.8) \quad h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 F_{t \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau}(\bar{\chi}_T(t)U(t)) d\tau$$

and in by the virtues of the same arguments I can do it with another copy of $E(0)$. Therefore

Proposition 1.1. *Under conditions (1.5) with an error $O(T^{-1}h^{1-d})$ I_m is equal to*

$$(1.9) \quad h^{-m} \text{Tr}' \int_{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{-,m}} F_{\mathbf{t} \rightarrow h^{-1}\boldsymbol{\tau}} \left(\bar{\chi}_T(t_1) U(t_1) \psi_2 \bar{\chi}_T(t_2) U(t_2) \psi_3 \cdots U(t_m) \psi_{m+1} \right) d\boldsymbol{\tau}$$

with $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_m)$, $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m)$.

Note that here one can take any $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, c]$ (but then an error depends on T). Further, note that as $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \psi_j, \text{supp } \psi_{j+1}) \geq (c_0 + \epsilon)T$ where c_0 here and below is the upper bound of the propagation speed on energy level 0 and $x^{m+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^1$, expression (1.9) as $m = 2$ or the similar expression as $m \geq 3$ become negligible and I arrive to

Corollary 1.2. *If in frames of proposition 1.1 $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \psi_j, \text{supp } \psi_{j+1}) \geq (c_0 + \epsilon)T$ for some $j = 1, \dots, m$ then $|I_m|$ does not exceed $CT^{-1}h^{1-d}$.*

1.2 Smooth case

The next step is to assume that ω is a smooth function. Without any loss of the generality one can assume that ω is also compactly supported (since ψ, ψ_1 are). Then from

$$(1.10) \quad \omega(x^1, \dots, x^m) = \int \omega(y^1, \dots, y^m) \delta(y^1 - x^1, \dots, y^m - x^m) dy = \int \omega'(y^1, \dots, y^m) \theta(y^1 - x^1) \cdots \theta(y^m - x^m) dy^1 \cdots dy^m$$

one arrives to

$$(1.11) \quad I_m = \int \omega'(y^1, \dots, y^m) J_2(y^1, \dots, y^m) dy^1 \cdots dy^m$$

with $J_2(y^1, \dots, y^m)$ defined by $\omega = 1$ and $\psi_j(x)$ redefined as $\psi_j(x)\theta(y^j - x)$ where here and below $\theta(x) = \theta(x_1) \cdots \theta(x_d)$. Then I immediately arrive to

Proposition 1.3. *Let ω and ψ_1, \dots, ψ_m be smooth functions and let condition (0.9) be fulfilled. Then $|I_m| \leq Ch^{-d}$.*

Remark 1.4. As $m = 2$ and $\omega, \psi_1, \psi_2 \in L^\infty$ $|I_2| \leq Ch^{-d}$ obviously (it follows from the estimate $\|\psi E \psi\|_2 \leq Ch^{-d/2}$ where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm). Can one prove the similar result for $m \geq 3$?

Proposition 1.5. *Let ω and ψ_1, \dots, ψ_m be smooth functions and let conditions (0.9) and (1.5) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *with an error $O(T^{-1}h^{1-d})$ I_m is equal to*

$$(1.12) \quad \mathcal{I}_m = h^{-m} \int \int_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{-,m}} \omega(x^1, \dots, x^m) F_{\mathbf{t} \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau} \left(\bar{\chi}_\tau(t_1) u(x^1, x^2, t_1) \psi_2(x^2) \bar{\chi}_\tau(t_2) \times \right. \\ \left. u(x^2, x^3, t_2) \psi_3(x^3) \cdots U(t_m) \psi_{m+1}(x^{m+1}) \right) d\tau dx^1 \cdots dx^m$$

with $x^{m+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^1$.

(ii) *Further, if $\text{dist}(\text{supp } \psi_j, \text{supp } \psi_{j+1}) \geq (c_0 + \epsilon)T$ for some $j = 1, \dots, m$ then $|I_m|$ does not exceed $CT^{-1}h^{1-d}$ where so far $T \asymp 1$.*

1.3 Singular homogeneous case

Theorem 1.6. *Let conditions (0.9) and (0.7) be fulfilled. Then $|I_m| \leq Ch^{-d-(m-1)\kappa}$.*

Proof. Let us replace $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ by $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\beta(z^1/\gamma_1) \cdots \beta(z^m/\gamma_m)$ where $\gamma_j \geq h$ and $\beta, \bar{\beta}$ are functions (on \mathbb{R}^d) similar to $\chi, \bar{\chi}$ respectively. Then similarly to the analysis of the smooth case one can estimate the contribution of such partition element to I_m by

$$(1.13) \quad Ch^{-d}(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m)^{-1}(\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_m)^{1-\kappa}$$

and summation with respect to $\gamma_j \geq \bar{\gamma} = h$ results in the value of this expression as $\gamma_j = \bar{\gamma}$ and the total estimate becomes what is claimed.

However one needs to consider the other partition elements when some of $\beta(z^j/\gamma_j)$ are replaced by $\bar{\beta}(z^j/\bar{\gamma})$. So we get “sandwiches” consisting of the factors

$$e(x^k, x^{k+1}, \tau) \beta(z^{k+1}/\gamma_{k+1}) \cdots \beta(z^j/\gamma_j) e(x^j, x^{j+1}, \tau)$$

with $j \geq k$ and in between them factors $\bar{\beta}(z^k/\bar{\gamma})$.

Let J be the set of indices appearing in $\bar{\beta}(z^k/\bar{\gamma})$ (for a given type of a “sandwich”). One can see easily that the contribution of each “sandwich” to I_m does not exceed

$$Ch^{-dr} \prod_{j \notin J} \gamma_j^{-\kappa} \times \left(\int_{\{|z| \leq \bar{\gamma}\}} |z|^{-\kappa} dz \right)^{r-1} \asymp Ch^{-dr} \prod_{j \notin J} \gamma_j^{-\kappa} \times \bar{\gamma}^{(d-\kappa)(r-1)}$$

where r is the number of factors of each type. Then after summation with respect to $\gamma_j \geq \bar{\gamma}$ one gets the same expression with $\gamma_j = \bar{\gamma}$ i.e. $Ch^{-dr} \bar{\gamma}^{\kappa(m-r) + (d-\kappa)(r-1)} = Ch^{-dr} \bar{\gamma}^{-\kappa(m-1) + d(r-1)}$ which is exactly what we want as $\bar{\gamma} \asymp h$. \square

It immediately follows from the proof a stronger condition

Proposition 1.7. *Let conditions (0.9) and (0.7) be fulfilled. Then replacing $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ by $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\bar{\beta}(z^1/\gamma) \cdots \bar{\beta}(z^m/\gamma)$ results in the error not exceeding*

$$(1.14) \quad Ch^{-d-(m-2)\kappa}\gamma^{-\kappa}.$$

Now let assume instead of condition (1.4) or (1.5) that

(1.15) $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$ is microhyperbolic on energy level 0 and microhyperbolicity directions are (at each point) $\ell_\xi \cdot \partial_\xi$ ³⁾ with $\ell_\xi = \ell_\xi(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$.

Proposition 1.8. *Let conditions (0.9), (0.7) and (1.15) be fulfilled. Then replacing $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ by $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})\bar{\beta}(z^1/\gamma) \cdots \bar{\beta}(z^m/\gamma)$ results in the error not exceeding*

$$(1.16) \quad Ch^{1-d-(m-2)\kappa}\gamma^{-1-\kappa}.$$

This is equivalent to taking $T \asymp \gamma$ in (1.8) and plugging Schwartz kernel of it instead of $e(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 0)$ in the definition of l_m .

Proof. Proof follows from the combined arguments of the proofs of Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 1.1; in this case one needs to consider only “sandwiches” containing at least one factor $\beta(x^j/\gamma_j)$ with $\gamma_j \geq \gamma$ which accounts for a factor h/γ_j and summation with respect to partition results in an extra factor h/γ . \square

So one needs to study expression (1.12) with some $T = T^*$; I remind that the remainder estimate contains factor T^{*-1} . One can decompose $\bar{\chi}_{T^*}(t)$ into the sum of $\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t)$ and $\chi_T(t)$ with T running between \bar{T} and T^* and also one can take $\bar{T} = Ch$. Then expression (1.12) becomes the sum of the similar expressions with $\bar{\chi}_T(t)$ (with $T = T^*$) replaced by $\phi_{jT_j}(t)$ where either $\phi_j = \chi$ and $\bar{T} \leq T_j \leq T^*$ or $\phi_j = \bar{\chi}$ and $T_j = \bar{T}$.

In this expression as $\phi_j = \chi$ one can replace $\int_{-\infty}^0 (\dots) d\tau$ by $(\dots)|_{\tau=0}$ simultaneously replacing $h^{-1}\chi_T(t)$ by $it^{-1}\chi_T(t) = T^{-1}\phi_T(t)$ with $\phi(t) = it^{-1}\chi(t)$; so we get a modified expression (1.12) with r factors $\bar{\chi}_{\bar{T}}(t_j)$ and τ_j snapped to 0 for $j \in J$, $r = \#J$ and integration over $\mathbb{R}^{-(m-r)}$ and $(m-r)$ factors $\phi_T(t_k)$, $k \notin J$; furthermore, factor h^{-m} is replaced by $h^{-r} \prod_{k \notin J} T_k^{-1}$.

Proposition 1.9. *Let conditions (0.9) and (1.15) be fulfilled and let ω be a smooth function,*

$$(1.17) \quad \omega = O(|x^1 - x^2| + \dots + |x^m - x^1|^K).$$

Then $l_m = O(h^{1-d})$ as $K > 1$ and $l_m = O(h^{1-d}|\log h|)$ as $K = 1$.

³⁾ So $\ell_x = 0$.

Proof. Proof follows from the combined arguments of the proofs of Theorem 1.6 and Proposition 1.1 like in Proposition 1.8. Here however the main contribution (as $K \geq 1$) is delivered by zone $\{|x^1 - x^2| + \dots + |x^m - x^1| \asymp 1\}$. \square

One can consider certain generalizations but I will do it later.

2 Calculations

Now our purpose is to go from implicit Tauberian expression (1.12) to more explicit one.

2.1 Constant Coefficients Case

Let us first consider case $A(x, \xi) = A(\xi)$. In this case

$$(2.1) \quad e(x, y, \tau) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int e^{ih^{-1}\langle x-y, \xi \rangle} E(\xi) d\xi$$

where $E(\xi, \tau)$ is the matrix projector corresponding to $A(\xi)$. Then

$$(2.2) \quad I_m = (2\pi h)^{-dm} \int \int \omega(x^1, \dots, x^m) E(\xi^1, 0) \cdots E(\xi^m, 0) \times \\ e^{ih^{-1}(\langle x^1-x^2, \xi^1 \rangle + \langle x^2-x^3, \xi^2 \rangle + \dots + \langle x^m-x^1, \xi^m \rangle)} dx^1 \cdots dx^m d\xi^1 \cdots d\xi^m.$$

(2.3) From now and until the end of the paper I am assuming that $m = 2$.

Without any loss of the generality one can assume that either $\omega(x, y)$ is of the form

$$(2.4) \quad \omega(x, y) = \Omega\left(\frac{1}{2}(x+y), x-y\right).$$

or it is of the same singular type as before but multiplied by $(x_k - y_k)$. However in the latter case (under microhyperbolicity condition) one can apply a Tauberian approximation for $e(x, y, \tau)$ equal 0 with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d}|x-y|^{-1})$ (in the same trace class as before) which leads to $I \approx 0$ with the sought remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

In the former case (2.4) we get

$$(2.5) \quad I \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I_2 = \int \mathcal{J}(x) dx,$$

where

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{J}(x) = 2(2\pi h)^{-2d} \iiint \Omega(x, z) E(\xi, 0) E(\eta, 0) e^{ih^{-1}\langle z, \xi - \eta \rangle} dz d\xi d\eta = G(x) h^{-d-\kappa},$$

with

$$(2.7) \quad G(x) = \iint \hat{\Omega}(x, \xi - \eta) E(\xi, 0) E(\eta, 0) d\xi d\eta,$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad \hat{\Omega}(x, \zeta) = 2(2\pi)^{-2d} \int \Omega(x, z) e^{i\langle z, \zeta \rangle} dz.$$

One always can take Ω having a compact support with respect to x (since we had originally cutoffs $\psi_1(x^1), \dots, \psi_m(x^m)$).

Remark 2.1. (i) One can easily generalize (2.5)–(2.8) to $m > 2$.

(ii) Integral (2.8) converges as $|z| \leq 1$ since $\kappa < d$. On the other hand it defines a distribution with respect to ζ which is positively homogeneous of degree $\kappa - d$ and also is smooth as $\zeta \neq 0$; thus $\hat{\Omega} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}$ and (2.7) is well-defined. However generalization to $m > 2$ is not that easy.

2.2 General Microhyperbolic Case

Note first that due to the microhyperbolicity condition (1.15) one should take $T \asymp \gamma$ as $m = 2$ ⁴⁾. Otherwise as $T \in [Ch^{1-\delta}, T^*]$, T^* is the small constant, the contribution of $[T/2, T] \cup [-T, -T/2]$ would be negligible.

To calculate u let us apply the successive approximation method on the time interval $[-T, T]$ with $h^{1-\delta} \leq T$. Then plugging the successive approximation into any copy on that interval we arrive to an error in u in the trace norm equal to $O(h^{-d}(T^2/h)^n)$ where n is the number of the first dropped term (starting from 0). This leads to the error in l $O(h^{-d-\kappa}(T^2/h)^n \gamma^{-\kappa})$ as $T \geq \gamma$. Since under microhyperbolicity assumption (1.15) we need to consider only $T \asymp \gamma$, the error is $O(h^{-d}(T^2/h)^n T^{-\kappa})$. However if we just take $u = 0$ then we get an error $O(h^{1-d} T^{-1-\kappa})$.

Finding T from the equation

$$h^{-d}(T^2/h)^n = h^{1-d} T^{-1}$$

⁴⁾ And $T_j \asymp |x^j - x^{j+1}|$ in the general case.

we get

$$(2.9) \quad T = h^{(n+1)/(2n+1)}$$

(which is greater than $h^{1-\delta}$ with $\delta > 0$) and this leads to an error

$$(2.10) \quad O(h^{1-d-(n+1)(\kappa+1)/(2n+1)})$$

Proposition 2.2. *Let conditions (0.9), (0.7) and (1.15) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *Using successive approximation as $|\mathbf{t}| \leq T$ given by (2.2) and taking $\mathbf{u} = 0$ otherwise we get I with an error given by (2.10).*

(ii) *In particular this is the sharp remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ as*

$$(2.11) \quad \kappa \geq (n+1)/n;$$

in particular, as $\kappa \geq 2$ one can skip all perturbation terms and get the same answer (2.4) – (2.7).

On the other hand, if we cannot skip some term, then this is given by the same formulae (2.4)–(2.7) as before but with the factor $h^{-d-\kappa+s}$ instead of $h^{-d-\kappa}$ and with Ω replaced by Ω_s positively homogeneous of degree $-\kappa + s$ (provided these formulae have sense!). Then as long as $s < \kappa$ one can see that these terms are less than the remainder estimate and we arrive to

Proposition 2.3. *Let conditions (0.9), (0.7) and (1.15) be fulfilled. Then*

(i) *As $\kappa > 1$ formulae (2.4)–(2.7) provide an answer with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.*

(ii) *As $\kappa \leq 1$ formulae (2.4) – (2.7) provide an answer with the remainder estimate $O(h^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\kappa)-d-\kappa-\delta})$ with arbitrarily small exponent $\delta > 0$.*

2.3 Scalar Case

Let us completely analyze the case of scalar operator A .

2.3.1 Assume first that $\omega = 1$ and ψ_1, ψ_2 are smooth functions. Then one can rewrite (1.9) with $m = 2$

$$(2.12) \quad h^{-2} \text{Tr} \int_{(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{-,2}} F_{\mathbf{t}_1 \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau_1, \mathbf{t}_2 \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau_2} \left(\bar{\chi}_T(\mathbf{t}_1) \bar{\chi}_T(\mathbf{t}_2) \psi_1 U(\mathbf{t}_1) \psi_2 U(\mathbf{t}_2) \right) d\tau$$

with $T = T^*$ which is the largest value for which remainder estimate $O(T^{-1}h^{1-d})$ for the standard asymptotics was derived; here $T^* \asymp 1$.

If we replace some copies of $\bar{\chi}_T(t_k)$ by $\chi_{T_k}(t_k)$ with $Ch \leq T_k \leq T^*$ then one can replace also operator $h^{-1} \int_{-\infty}^0 (\dots) d\tau_k$ by $T^{-1}(\dots)|_{\tau_k=0}$ and χ by $it^{-1}\chi$.

If we do it with both $k = 1, 2$ then we get a term $O(h^{-d})$ (the better estimate is actually possible) and the summation with respect to all partitions with respect to T_1, T_2 results in $O(h^{-d}|\log h|^2)$ which differs from the proper estimate by $|\log h|^2$ factor. If we replace some copies of $\bar{\chi}_T(t_k)$ by $\bar{\chi}_h(t_k)$ then we do not make a transformation with respect to these factors but we gain a factor h due to the size of the support. So after summation with respect to partition we arrive to estimate $O(h^{-d}|\log h|^{2-r})$ for l where r is the number of $\bar{\chi}_h(t_k)$ factors.

On the other hand expression (2.12) is equal to

$$(2.13) \quad h^{-2} \text{Tr} \int_{(\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{-2}} F_{t_1 \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau_1, t_2 \rightarrow h^{-1}\tau_2} \left(\bar{\chi}_T(t_1) \bar{\chi}_T(t_2) \psi_1 \psi_{2, t_1} U(t_1 + t_2) \right) d\tau$$

with $\psi_t = U(t)\psi U(-t)$.

Applying standard approach we arrive to

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{I} \sim \sum_{n \geq 0} \varkappa_n h^{-d+n}$$

where $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_2$ is defined by (1.12).

Let us replace in (2.13) ψ_{2, t_1} by ψ_2 . Plugging $t_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2}t \pm z$, $\tau_{1,2} = \tau \pm \tau'$ we arrive to

$$(2.15) \quad h^{-1} \text{Tr} \int_{-\infty}^0 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_T(t, \tau) \psi_1 \psi_2 U(t) e^{-ih^{-1}t\tau} dt \right) d\tau$$

where $\rho_T(t, \tau) = \rho(t/T, \tau)$, $\tau < 0$

$$(2.16) \quad \rho(t, \tau) = -\pi^{-1} h^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\chi}_T\left(\frac{1}{2}t + z\right) \bar{\chi}_T\left(\frac{1}{2}t - z\right) z^{-1} \sin(h^{-1}Tz\tau) dz$$

is $C_0^\infty([-2, 2])$ and one can prove easily that

$$(2.17) \quad |\partial_t^n (\rho(t, \tau) \mp \bar{\chi}^2(t/2))| \leq C_{nm} (1 + |\tau|Th^{-1})^{-m} \quad \forall m, n \quad \forall \tau \lesssim 0.$$

Then due to (2.17) only zone $\{|\tau| \leq h^{1-\delta}\}$ gives a non-negligible contribution to this error and due to the microhyperbolicity condition there $|\text{Tr} \psi_1 \psi_2 U(t)| \leq Ch^{-d}(1 + |t|h^{-1})^{-m}$ which together with (2.17) implies

(2.18) Under microhyperbolicity condition (1.4) expression (2.15) is equal modulo $O(h^{1-d})$ to the same expression with ρ replaced by $\bar{\chi}^2(t/2)$.

On the other hand, if we replace ψ_{2,t_1} by $\psi_{2,t_1} - \psi_2 = t_1 \psi'_{2,t_1}$ then we can apply the same transformation as before just getting rid of one factor h^{-1} and integration with respect to τ_1 , which simply snaps to 0, resulting in expression, similar to (2.15) but with $\rho\psi_2$ replaced by

$$(2.19) \quad \rho'(t, \tau, x) = (2\pi)^{-1} i \int_{\mathbb{R}} \bar{\chi}_T(z) \bar{\chi}_T(t-z) e^{ih^{-1}\tau z} \psi'_{2,z} dz$$

which satisfies inequality similar to (2.17)

$$(2.20) \quad |\partial_t^n \rho(t, \tau)| \leq C_{nm} (1 + |\tau| Th^{-1})^{-m} \quad \forall m, n \quad \forall \tau \leq 0.$$

and therefore

(2.21) Under microhyperbolicity condition (1.4) this new (2.15)-type expression is $O(h^{1-d})$.

So, we are left with expression (2.15) with $\rho(t) = \bar{\chi}^2(t/2)$ but due to the standard theory we get modulo $O(h^{1-d})$ expression

$$(2.22) \quad \text{Tr } \psi_1 \psi_2 E(0) \equiv (2\pi h)^{-d} \iint_{\{a(x,\xi) < 0\}} \psi_1 \psi_2 dx d\xi.$$

So, \mathcal{I} is given by (2.22) modulo $O(h^{1-d})$ and therefore

$$(2.23) \quad \varkappa_0 = (2\pi)^{-d} \iint_{\{a(x,\xi) < 0\}} \psi_1 \psi_2 dx d\xi \quad \text{in (2.14).}$$

2.3.2 Then in the general smooth case we get

Proposition 2.4. *Let ω and ψ_1, \dots, ψ_m be smooth functions and let (0.9) and microhyperbolicity condition (1.4) be fulfilled. Then with an error $O(T^{-1}h^{1-d})$ where $T \asymp 1$ here decomposition (2.14) holds with*

$$(2.24) \quad \varkappa_0 = (2\pi)^{-d} \iint_{\{a(x,\xi) < 0\}} \omega(x, x) \psi_1(x) \psi_2(x) dx d\xi.$$

Proof. Follows from the standard decomposition (1.10)-(1.11). □

2.3.3 Consider now the case of singular homogeneous ω . First, let us consider \mathcal{I}_γ defined by (1.12) with $\omega = 1$ and ψ_1, ψ_2 replaced by $\psi_{1,\gamma}, \psi_{2,\gamma}$ which are some smooth functions scaled at some point z with the scaling parameter $\gamma \in (h^{1-\delta}, h^\delta)$. To have microhyperbolicity condition sustain scaling we replace it by (1.15). Then (2.14) implies

$$(2.25) \quad \mathcal{I}' \sim \sum_{n,m \geq 0} \varkappa_{nm} h^{-d+n} \gamma^{m-n+d}$$

and obviously

$$(2.26) \quad (2\pi)^{-d} \iint_{\{a(x,\xi) < 0\}} \psi_{1,\gamma}(x) \psi_{2,\gamma}(x) dx d\xi \sim \sum_{m \geq 0} \varkappa'_m \gamma^{m+d}.$$

One can see easily that in (2.25) terms with $m = 0$ would be the same for operator $A_z^0 = a_0(z, hD)$ where $a_0(x, \xi)$ is the principal symbol of A ; this z is not necessarily the original one, but distance between them should not exceed $c\gamma$; similarly in (2.26) term with $m = 0$ coincides with the left-hand expression with $a(x, \xi)$ replaced by $a(z, \xi)$.

What is more, under condition (1.15) integration with respect to x is not needed, so all these results would hold (without factor γ^d in the decomposition and estimates) without it; thus one can take $z = x$ (or y , does not matter).

Thus we arrive to

Proposition 2.5. *Let \mathcal{I}' be defined by (1.12) with $\omega = 1$ and ψ_1, ψ_2 replaced by $\psi_{1,\gamma}, \psi_{2,\gamma}$ which are the same smooth functions scaled at some point z with the parameter $\gamma \in (h^{1-\delta}, h^\delta)$. Let $\mathcal{I}^{0'}$ be defined the same way but with $U(t)$ replaced by $U^0(t) = e^{ih^{-1}tA^0}$ where $A^0 = a(z, hD)$ and later z is set to x . Then $\mathcal{I}' - \mathcal{I}_m^{0'} = O(h^{1-d}\gamma^d)$*

Now we can calculate \mathcal{I} in the scalar case:

Proposition 2.6. *In frames of proposition 2.5 as ω satisfies (1.7) and $\kappa > 0$ $\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{I}^0 = O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ where \mathcal{I}^0 is defined for constant-coefficient operator obtained by freezing coefficients of A at point x (or y , does not matter).*

Proof. Consider three zones: $\{|x-y| \gtrsim \gamma_1\}$ with $\gamma_1 \asymp h^\delta$, $\{\gamma \lesssim |x-y| \lesssim \gamma_1\}$ with $\gamma_0 \asymp h^{1-\delta}$ and $\{|x-y| \lesssim \gamma\}$; then the contribution of the first zone to the reminder for \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{I}^0 does not exceed $Ch^{1-d}\gamma_1^{-1-\kappa} = O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ (while main parts are 0); in virtue of proposition 2.5 and decomposition of subsection 1.2 the contribution of the second zone to $\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{I}^0$ does not exceed $O(h^{1-d}\gamma^{-\kappa}) = o(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

In the third zone one can apply the method of successive approximations resulting in

$$\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{I}^0 \sim h^{-d} \sum_{m+n+k \geq 1} \varkappa''_{mnk} h^{-d+n-m+k-\kappa} \gamma^{2m-n}.$$

However since the final answer does not depend on γ only terms with $2m = n$ are posed to survive just resulting in $(\varkappa + o(1))h^{-d+1-\kappa}$. \square

Summarizing results of section 1, proposition 2.6 and formulae (2.5)–(2.8) we arrive to

Theorem 2.7. *Let A be a scalar operator satisfying conditions (0.9) and (1.15). Then*

$$(2.27) \quad I = \int \mathcal{J}(x)\psi_1(x)\psi_2(x) dx + O(h^{1-d-\kappa}),$$

where

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(x) &= 2(2\pi h)^{-2d} \iiint E(x, \xi, 0)\Omega(x, z)E(x, \eta, 0)e^{ih^{-1}\langle z, \xi - \eta \rangle} dz d\xi d\eta = \\ & 2(2\pi h)^{-2d} \iiint_{\{a(x, \xi) < 0, a(x, \eta) < 0\}} \Omega(x, z)e^{ih^{-1}\langle z, \xi - \eta \rangle} dz d\xi d\eta = G(x)h^{-d-\kappa}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{aligned} G(x) &= \iint E(x, \xi, 0)\hat{\Omega}(x, \xi - \eta)E(x, \eta, 0) d\xi d\eta = \\ & \iint_{\{a(x, \xi) < 0, a(x, \eta) < 0\}} \hat{\Omega}(x, \xi - \eta) d\xi d\eta, \end{aligned}$$

and $\hat{\Omega}$ is defined by (2.8).

Remark 2.8. (i) Alternatively one can prove this theorem using oscillatory integral representation of $u(x, y, t)$ as $|t| \leq T = \epsilon$.

(ii) Alternatively one can replace one or both copies of x in $E(x, \dots)$ or in $a(x, 0)$ by y .

Definition 2.9. We will refer to formulae (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) as to *standard Weyl expression* even in the matrix case. However in this case the third parts of (2.27), (2.28) should be skipped.

2.4 Schrödinger operator

Now my goal is to weaken and eventually to get rid off microhyperbolicity condition for scalar operators. I start from the Schrödinger operator.

For a Schrödinger operator condition of microhyperbolicity (1.15) means that

$$(2.30) \quad V \geq \epsilon_0.$$

If this condition is violated let us introduce scaling functions $\rho(x)$, $\gamma(x)$ in the usual way $\gamma = \epsilon|V|$ and $\rho = \gamma^{1/2}$.

Then, the contribution of $B(\bar{x}, \gamma(\bar{x}))^2$ to the remainder does not exceed

$$(2.31) \quad C(h/\rho\gamma)^{1-d-\kappa}\gamma^{-\kappa} \asymp Ch^{1-d-\kappa}\rho^{d-1-\kappa}\gamma^{d-1}$$

with $\rho = \rho(\bar{x})$ and $\gamma = \gamma(\bar{x})$ and then the contribution of zone

$$(2.32) \quad \{(x, y) : |x - y| \leq \epsilon\gamma(x)\}$$

(where automatically $\gamma(x) \asymp \gamma(y)$) to the remainder does not exceed

$$(2.33) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa} \int \rho^{d-1+\kappa}\gamma^{-1} dx$$

and with $\rho = \gamma^{1/2}$ here it becomes

$$(2.34) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa} \int \gamma^{(d-3+\kappa)/2} dx;$$

obviously, it is $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ provided *either* $d + \kappa \geq 3$ *or*

$$(2.35) \quad |V| + |\nabla V| \geq \epsilon_0.$$

and $d + \kappa > 1$ (which is surely the case).

Remark 2.10. (i) Note that (2.35) is microhyperbolicity condition (1.4).

(ii) Actually one should take $\rho\gamma \geq Ch$ and thus to add $Ch^{1/3}$ and $Ch^{2/3}$ to ρ, γ respectively (but it does not affect our conclusion due to the standard fact that if $\rho\gamma \asymp h$ then $h_{\text{eff}} \asymp 1$ and condition (2.35) is not needed.

Consider now the complement of zone (2.32). Let us redefine there $\gamma(x)$ as $\gamma(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}|x - y|$ and in this zone condition (2.35) is not needed as one can see easily after rescaling $B(x, \gamma(x, y))$ to $B(0, 1)$ due to proposition 1.5.

Therefore as $\gamma \geq \gamma(x)$ the contribution of $B(x, \gamma)^2 \setminus \{\text{zone (2.32)}\}$ to the remainder does not exceed the same expression (2.31) with $\rho = \gamma^{1/2}$. Then the contribution of the complement of zone (2.32) to the remainder does not exceed

$$(2.36) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa} \iint_{\{|x-y| \geq \epsilon \max(\gamma(x), \gamma(y))\}} |x - y|^{(d-1+\kappa)/2-1-d} dx dy.$$

One can see easily that expression (2.36) is $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ as $d + \kappa > 3$ (so this case is already covered).

Further, expression (2.36) does not exceed expression (2.34) with $\gamma = \gamma(x)$ and expression

$$(2.37) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa} \int (|\log \gamma(x)| + 1) dx$$

as $d + \kappa < 3$ and $d + \kappa = 3$ respectively and both these expressions are $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ under condition (2.35).

Again we get $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ provided either $d + \kappa > 3$ or condition (2.35) is fulfilled. So, we arrive to

Proposition 2.11. *Consider Schrödinger operator. Let either $d + \kappa > 3$ or condition (2.35) be fulfilled. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27) – (2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.*

This completely covers the case $d \geq 3$. Furthermore, after proposition 2.11 is proven, we can introduce scaling functions $\gamma = \rho = \epsilon(|V| + |\nabla V|^2)^{1/2} + Ch^{1/2}$ and then applying the same arguments we arrive to

Proposition 2.12. *Consider Schrödinger operator. Let either $d + \kappa > 2$ or condition*

$$(2.38) \quad |V| + |\nabla V| + |\nabla^2 V| \geq \epsilon$$

be fulfilled. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27) – (2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

This completely covers the case $d = 2$. As $d = 1$ we get the required remainder estimate under condition (2.38).

Now, combining this with the arguments of the proof of Theorem 4.4.9 of [Ivr1] we get⁵⁾

Proposition 2.13. *Consider Schrödinger operator with $d = 1$, $\kappa > 0$. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27) – (2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.*

Remark 2.14. Actually all above results hold as $\kappa = 0$ as well with the singular exception of $d = 1$ when the remainder estimate $O(1)$ is recovered under condition

$$(2.39) \quad \sum_{|\beta| \leq K} |\nabla_x^\beta V| \geq \epsilon;$$

without it the remainder estimate is $O(h^{-\delta})$ with arbitrarily small $\delta > 0$.

⁵⁾ I am leaving easy details to the reader; see also the proof of Theorem 2.19.

2.5 Scalar Case. II

2.5.1 Let us consider general scalar operators.

Remark 2.15. (i) Actually instead of condition (0.9) one can make a cut-off with respect to ξ replacing functions $\psi_j(x)$ by pseudo-differential operators $\psi_j(x, hD)$ with smooth compactly supported symbols;

(ii) Alternatively we can replace $E(0)$ by $E(\tau, \tau') = E(\tau) - E(\tau')$ with conditions satisfied for $a - \tau$ and $a - \tau'$ instead of a .

(iii) Alternatively we can replace $E(0)$ by

$$(2.40) \quad E'(\tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} E(0, \tau') \varphi(\tau') d\tau'$$

with smooth function φ s.t. $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(\tau') d\tau' = 1$.

In all these cases obvious modifications of the final formulae are needed.

Now we can introduce scaling functions

$$(2.41) \quad \gamma(x, \xi) = \epsilon(|\nabla_{\xi} a|^2 + |a|) + Ch^{2/3}, \quad \rho(x, \xi) = \gamma^{1/2}(x, \xi)$$

and repeat arguments of the previous subsection; then expression (2.33) will be replaced by $Ch^{1-d-\kappa}M$ with

$$(2.42) \quad M = \int \rho^{\kappa-1} \gamma^{-1} dx d\xi \asymp \int (|\nabla_{\xi} a|^2 + |a|)^{(\kappa-3)/2} dx d\xi$$

(in zone $\{\rho\gamma \geq Ch\}$). Therefore we arrive to the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ provided $M = O(1)$ as *now integral in M is taken over $B(0, 1)$.*

This is definitely the case as $\kappa \geq 3$. Assume now that microhyperbolicity condition (1.4) is fulfilled. Then $M = O(1)$ as $\kappa > 1$; otherwise this condition becomes

$$(2.43) \quad \int_{\Sigma} |\nabla_{\xi} a|^{\kappa-1} d\mu < \infty \quad \text{as } 0 < \kappa < 1, \quad \int_{\Sigma} |\log |\nabla_{\xi} a|| d\mu < \infty$$

with $\Sigma = \{a(x, \xi) = 0\}$ and $d\mu = dx d\xi : da$ measure on Σ .

Thus we arrive to the following generalization of proposition 2.11:

Proposition 2.16. *Let A be a scalar operator satisfying condition (0.9). Assume that the uniform version of condition⁶⁾*

$$(2.44)_r \quad a = \nabla_{\xi} a = 0 \implies \text{rank Hess}_{\xi\xi} a \geq r$$

⁶⁾ I.e. $|a| + |\nabla_{\xi} a| \leq \epsilon$ implies that $\text{Hess}_{\xi\xi} a$ has r eigenvalues which absolute values are greater than ϵ .

is fulfilled. Then

(i) As $r + \kappa > 3$ the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$;

(ii) Under condition (1.4) as $r + \kappa > 1$ the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

Proof. In contrast to standard asymptotics we need to consider not points (x, ξ) but pairs $(x, \xi; y, \eta)$ and the pure standard arguments work in zones

$$(2.45) \quad \{(x, \xi; y, \eta) : |x - y| \leq \epsilon\gamma(x, \xi), |\xi - \eta| \leq \epsilon\rho(x, \xi)\}$$

where also $\gamma(y, \eta) \asymp \gamma(x, \xi)$ and $\rho(y, \eta) \asymp \rho(x, \xi)$. Analysis in the complimentary zone I postpone until the proof of theorem 2.19 where it will be done in more general settings. \square

Now introducing scaling functions

$$(2.46) \quad \gamma(x, \xi) = \epsilon(|\nabla_{x,\xi} a|^2 + |a|)^{1/2} + Ch^{1/2}, \quad \rho(x, \xi) = \gamma(x, \xi)$$

and repeating the same arguments we arrive to the following generalization of proposition 2.12:

Proposition 2.17. *Let A be a scalar operator satisfying condition (0.9). Assume that the uniform version of condition (2.44)_r is fulfilled. Then as $r + \kappa > 2$ the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.*

Again, combining this with the arguments of Theorem 4.4.9 of [Ivr1] we arrive to the following generalization of proposition 2.12

Proposition 2.18. *Let A be a scalar operator satisfying conditions (0.9) and (2.44)₁ and let $\kappa > 0$. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.*

2.5.2 Now we can prove our main result for scalar operators:

Theorem 2.19. *Consider scalar operator. Let conditions (0.9) and*

$$(2.47)_n \quad \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} |\nabla_{\xi}^k a| \geq \epsilon_0$$

with some n be fulfilled. Let ω satisfy (1.7) and $\kappa > 0$. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27)–(2.29), (2.8) holds with the remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

Proof Part I. In this part of the proof we consider at each step only zone (2.45) where γ will be defined in different ways later. Treatment of the complementary zone will be described in Part II.

So, we proved the statement of the theorem under condition (2.44)₁ which is equivalent to (2.47)₂.

Let us apply induction with respect to n . Assume that under condition (2.47)_n required estimate is proven.

In the general case (without condition (2.47)_n) we can introduce scaling functions in the manner similar to (2.41):

$$(2.48)_n \quad \gamma(x, \xi) = \epsilon \left(\sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} |\nabla_{\xi}^k \mathbf{a}|^{N/(n-k+1)} \right)^{(n+1)/N} + Ch^{(n+1)/(n+2)}, \quad \rho(x, \xi) = \gamma^{1/(n+1)}(x, \xi)$$

with $N = (n+1)!$.

Therefore under assumption of induction we get again remainder estimate $Ch^{1-d+\kappa}M$ with M given by (2.42) where this time the right-hand expression becomes

$$(2.49)_n \quad M = \int \gamma^{(\kappa-n-2)/(n+1)} dx d\xi;$$

under condition (1.4) this expression becomes

$$(2.50)_n \quad M \asymp \int_{\Sigma} \gamma^{(\kappa-1)/(n+1)} d\mu \asymp \int_{\Sigma} \left(\sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} |\nabla_{\xi}^k \mathbf{a}|^{1/(n-k+1)} \right)^{\kappa-1} d\mu$$

which is $O(1)$ under assumption $|\nabla_{\xi}^{n+1} \mathbf{a}| \geq \epsilon_0$ (as lower order derivatives with respect to ξ are close to 0). This is exactly condition (2.47)_{n+1}.

So, now we have a proper estimate under condition (2.47)_{n+1} instead of (2.47)_n but now we also need condition (1.4).

Without condition (1.4) we would need something different; f.e. ignoring integration with respect to x one should assume that $\text{rank}(\nabla_{\xi}^{n+1} \mathbf{a}) + \kappa > n+2$ where the rank of multilinear symmetric m -form G is $d - \dim \text{Ker } G$; $\text{Ker } G = \{x : G(x, x^2, \dots, x^m) = 0 \forall x^2, \dots, x^m\}$. This is rather unusable.

Instead I want to weaken condition (1.4), replacing it by

$$(2.51)_{n+1, m} \quad \sum_{2 \leq j \leq n+1, l: m+j: (n+1) \leq 1} |\nabla_x^l \nabla_{\xi}^j| \geq \epsilon_0$$

for some $m > 0$ which is not necessarily an integer. Obviously in our assumptions (1.4) coincides with (2.51)_{n+1, 1}.

Let us run a kind of nested induction. So, *let us assume that under conditions (2.47)_{n+1} and (2.51)_{n+1,m} remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ is proven.*

Now we can go to something similar (2.46):

$$(2.52)_{n,m} \quad \gamma(x, \xi) = \epsilon \left(\sum_{k,l:k+n+l:m \leq 1} |\nabla_{\xi}^k \nabla_x^l a|^{Ns_{kl}} \right)^{1/N} + \bar{\gamma}, \quad \bar{\gamma} = Ch^{(n+1)/(m+n+2)},$$

$$\rho(x, \xi) = \gamma^{(m+1)/(n+1)}(x, \xi), \quad s_{kl} = \frac{n+1}{(m+1)(n+1) - (m+1)k - (n+1)l}.$$

Then we recover remainder estimate $Ch^{1-d-\kappa}M$ with M defined by (2.42) which is now

$$(2.53)_{nm} \quad M \asymp \int \gamma^{-1+(m+1)(\kappa-1)/(n+1)} dx d\xi \asymp \int \rho^{-(n+1)/(m+1)+(\kappa-1)} dx d\xi.$$

Under condition (2.47)_{n+1} we can assume without any loss of the generality that

$$(2.54) \quad a(x, \xi) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n+1} b_j(x, \xi') \xi_1^{n+1-j}, \quad b_0 = 1, \quad b_1 = 0;$$

we can always reach it by change of coordinates and multiplication of A by an appropriate positive pseudo-differential factor. Then

$$(2.55) \quad \rho \asymp |\xi_1| + \tilde{\rho}, \quad \tilde{\rho} = \tilde{\gamma}(x, \xi')^{(m+1)/(n+1)}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} = \sum_{j,k,l:(k+j):n+(l:m) \leq 1} |\nabla_{\xi'}^k \nabla_x^l b_j|^{s_{(k+j)l}} + \bar{\gamma}.$$

Then

$$(2.56)_{nm} \quad M \asymp \int \tilde{\rho}^{-(n+1)/(m+1)+\kappa} dx d\xi' \asymp \int \tilde{\gamma}^{-1+(m+1)\kappa/(n+1)} dx d\xi'$$

(with an extra logarithmic factor as the power is 0). Then $M = O(1)$ as

$$(2.57) \quad (m+1)\kappa/(n+1) > 1.$$

Moreover, $M = O(1)$ provided there exists (j, k, l) with $|\nabla_{\xi'}^k \nabla_x^l b_j| \geq \epsilon_0$ and *either* $k \geq 1$, $(k+j-1) : n+l : m \leq 1$, $s_{k+j-1,l} < 1$ *or* $l \geq 1$, $(k+j) : n+(l-1) : m \leq 1$, $s_{k+j,l-1} < 1$.

Therefore one can derive easily

(2.58) If remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ holds under condition (2.51)_{n+1,m'} for every $m' < m$, then it also holds under condition (2.51)_{n+1,m}.

On the other hand there exists a discrete set $\{m_\nu\}_{\nu=1,2,\dots}$ with $m_1 < m_2 < \dots$ such that if condition (2.51) $_{n+1,m}$ is fulfilled for $m = m_\nu$ then it is fulfilled for all $m \in (m_\nu, m_{\nu+1})$ as well.

This justifies induction with respect to m running this set and therefore remainder estimate $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ holds under condition (2.51) $_{n+1,m}$ no matter how large m is. However if m is large enough, condition (2.57) is fulfilled and we do not need condition (2.51) $_{n+1,m}$ anymore.

This concludes induction with respect to n . \square

Proof Part II. However in contrast to standard asymptotics we need to consider not points (x, ξ) but pairs $(x, \xi; y, \eta)$ and the pure standard arguments work in zone (2.45).

It follows from the standard theory that if Q_x and Q_y have symbols supported in $\epsilon(\rho_x, \gamma_x)$ - and $\epsilon(\rho_y, \gamma_y)$ - vicinities of (x, ξ) and (y, η) respectively then

$$(2.59) \quad \|Q_x E Q_y\|_1 \leq Ch^{-d}(\rho_x \gamma_x)^{d/2}(\rho_y \gamma_y)^{d/2}$$

and moreover, if either $|x - y| \geq \epsilon_0 \gamma_x$ or $|\xi - \eta| \geq \epsilon_0 \rho_x$ then

$$(2.60) \quad \|Q_x E Q_y\|_1 \leq Ch^{1-d}(\rho_x \gamma_x)^{d/2-1}(\rho_y \gamma_y)^{d/2}.$$

Surely the same will be true with (x, ξ) and (y, η) permuted.

Then contribution of such pair to the error estimate does not exceed

$$(2.61) \quad Ch^{1-d}(\rho_x \gamma_x)^{d/2-1}(\rho_y \gamma_y)^{d/2}|x - y|^{-\kappa}$$

if $|x - y| \geq \epsilon_0 \gamma_x$.

Otherwise contribution of the pair $\psi_x Q_x$ and Q_y to the error estimate does not exceed $Ch^{1-d}(\rho_x \gamma_x)^{d/2-1}(\rho_y \gamma_y)^{d/2}\gamma^{-\kappa}$ where $\psi_x, (1 - \psi_x)$ are supported in $\{|x - y| \geq \gamma\}$ and $\{|x - y| \leq 2\gamma\}$ and $\gamma \geq h\rho_x^{-1}$.

Furthermore, since

$$(2.62) \quad |Q_x E Q_y| \leq Ch^{1-d}\rho_x^{d/2-1}\gamma_x^{-1}\rho_y^{d/2}$$

due to the standard arguments, contribution of the pair $(1 - \psi_x)Q_x$ and Q_y to the error does not exceed $Ch^{2-2d}\rho_x^{d-2}\rho_y^d\gamma_x^{-2}\gamma_y^d\gamma^{d-\kappa}$. Plugging $\gamma = h\rho_x^{-1}$ we estimate the contribution of the pair Q_x, Q_y by

$$(2.63) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa}(\rho_x \gamma_x)^{d/2-1}(\rho_y \gamma_y)^{d/2}\rho_x^\kappa + Ch^{2-d-\kappa}\rho_x^{-2+\kappa}\gamma_x^{-2}\rho_y^d\gamma_y^d$$

which is larger than (2.61).

In these estimates we do not need non-degeneracy condition and therefore as (y, η) and (x, ξ) are given we can take

$$(2.64) \quad \rho_x = \rho_y = |x - y|^\sigma + |\xi - \eta|, \gamma_x = \gamma_y |x - y| + |\xi - \eta|^{1/\sigma},$$

where $\rho = \gamma^\sigma$ on the corresponding step of our analysis. Then as (z, ζ) are fixed contribution of $\{|x - z| \leq \gamma, |y - z| \leq \gamma, |\xi - \zeta| \leq \rho, |\eta - \zeta| \leq \rho, |x - y| + |\xi - \eta|^{1/\sigma} \geq \epsilon\gamma\}$ to the error does not exceed this expression

$$(2.65) \quad Ch^{1-d-\kappa}(\rho\gamma)^{d-1}\rho^\kappa + Ch^{2-d-\kappa}(\rho\gamma)^{d-2}\rho^\kappa$$

where the second term is less than the first one.

Then the total contribution of the zone in question to the error does not exceed

$$(2.66) \quad Ch^{1-d} \iiint \gamma^{\sigma\kappa-\sigma-1} dyd\eta \gamma^{-1} d\gamma$$

where equation is taken over $\{\gamma \geq \gamma_x\}$ and the integral in question is equivalent to Mh^{1-d} where $M = 1$ as $\sigma(\kappa - 1) > 1$,

$$(2.67) \quad M = \iiint |\log \gamma(y, \eta)| dyd\eta$$

as $\sigma(\kappa - 1) = 1$ and due to (2.47)_n $M \asymp 1$ as well,

$$(2.68) \quad M = \iiint \gamma(y, \eta)^{\sigma\kappa-\sigma-1} dyd\eta$$

as $\sigma(\kappa - 1) < 1$, and on each step of the induction we already proved that $M \asymp 1$. \square

2.6 General Microhyperbolic Case. II

Let us consider matrix operator. Let $\lambda_j(x, \xi)$ be eigenvalues of its principal part. Then $|\nabla_{x,\xi} \lambda_j| \leq c$ and microhyperbolicity with respect to ℓ means that

$$(2.69) \quad |\lambda_j(x, \xi)| \leq \epsilon_0 \implies (\ell \lambda_j)(x, \xi) \geq \epsilon_0 \quad \forall j.$$

Let us consider zone

$$(2.70) \quad \mathcal{U}_j = \{(x, \xi) : |\lambda_j| \lesssim \min_{k \neq j} |\lambda_k|\}$$

and let us define here

$$(2.71) \quad \gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{k \neq j} |\lambda_k| + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\gamma}$$

and $\rho = \gamma$. Consider zone

$$(2.72) \quad \{\gamma \geq |x - y| + |\xi - \eta| + \bar{\gamma}\}$$

and let us rescale $x \mapsto x/\gamma$, $\xi \mapsto \xi/\gamma$, $\lambda_k \mapsto \lambda_k/\gamma$, $h \mapsto h/\gamma^2$ preserving microhyperbolicity condition (1.15) and simultaneously making operator with $|\lambda_k| \geq 1$ for $k \neq j$ and therefore analysis of this operator is not different from the scalar one. Unfortunately we cannot use non-degeneracy conditions of subsections 2.4–2.5 which would not survive this, but microhyperbolicity condition survives and *we assume that (1.15) is fulfilled*.

Then as the main part of the asymptotics is given by the standard Weyl expression (2.27)–(2.29), the contribution of zone (2.72) (intersected with $\{\gamma \geq C_0 \bar{\gamma}\}$) to the remainder does not exceed

$$(2.73) \quad R_j = \int_{\Sigma_j \cap \{\gamma \geq C\bar{\gamma}\}} C(h\gamma^{-2})^{1-d-\kappa} \gamma^{-\kappa-2d} d\wp_j \asymp Ch^{1-d-\kappa} \int_{\Sigma_j \cap \{\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}\}} \gamma^{-2+\kappa} d\wp_j$$

with $\Sigma_j = \{(x, \xi) : \lambda_j = 0\}$ and $d\wp_j = dx d\xi : d\lambda_j$ density on it.

Let us fix $\bar{\gamma} = Ch^{1/2}$. Then in the complementary zone $\cup_{k \neq j} \{|\lambda_j| + |\lambda_k| \leq C\bar{\gamma}\}$ one needs just to make a rescaling $x \mapsto x/\bar{\gamma}$, $\xi \mapsto \xi/\bar{\gamma}$ which sends h to 1 and no microhyperbolicity condition would be needed and the contribution of this zone would not exceed

$$(2.74) \quad R'_{jk} = Ch^{-d-\kappa/2} \text{mes}\{|\lambda_j| + |\lambda_k| \leq Ch^{1/2}\}.$$

So, the total contribution of zone $\cup_j \mathcal{U}_j$ to the remainder is given by $\sum_j R_j + \sum_{j,k:j \neq k} R'_{jk}$. Assuming that

$$(2.75) \quad \wp_j(\Sigma_j : |\lambda_k| \leq t) + t^{-1} \text{mes}\{|\lambda_j| + |\lambda_k| \leq t\} = O(t^r).$$

we get under additional assumption $r + \kappa > 2$ (which is always fulfilled as $r \geq 2$) that $R_j = O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ while $R'_{jk} = O(h^q)$ with

$$(2.76) \quad q = -d - \frac{1}{2}\kappa + \frac{r}{2}.$$

which is $O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$ as well.

On the other hand, as $r + \kappa < 2$ we get that $R_j = O(h^q)$, $R'_{jk} = O(h^q)$ with q given by (2.77).

Finally, as $r + \kappa = 2$ we get $R_j = O(h^{1-d-\kappa} |\log h|)$ and $R_{jk} = O(h^{1-d-\kappa})$.

Assume temporarily that no more than two eigenvalues can be close to 0 simultaneously. Then we are already done since in the zone complimentary to (2.72) we redefine $\gamma = \epsilon(|x - y| + |\xi - \eta|)$ and apply the same rescaling as before and one does not need microhyperbolicity condition.

Let us apply induction by m assuming that no more than m eigenvalues can be close to 0 simultaneously. Then we can define on each step

$$(2.77) \quad \gamma(x, \xi) = \epsilon \max_{J: \#J=m} \min_{k \notin J} |\lambda_k(x, \xi)| + \bar{\gamma}$$

and repeat all above arguments. We will arrive to

Theorem 2.20. *Let conditions (0.9), (0.7), (1.15) and (2.75) be fulfilled. Then the standard Weyl asymptotics (2.27) – (2.29) holds with the remainder estimate*

(i) *which is $O(h^{1-d-(m-1)\kappa})$ as $r + \kappa > 2$;*

(ii) *which is $O(h^q)$ with q defined by (2.76) as $r + q\kappa < 2$ and $O(h^{1-d-\kappa} |\log h|)$ as $r + \kappa = 2$.*

Remark 2.21. Condition (2.75) is fulfilled provided $\Lambda_{jk} = \{\lambda_j = \lambda_k = 0\}$ are smooth manifolds of codimension r and $|\lambda_j| \asymp |\lambda_k| \asymp \text{dist}((x, \xi), \Lambda_{jk})$ in its vicinity; this assumption should be fulfilled for all $j \neq k$.

References

- [BrIvr] M. BRONSTEIN, V. IVRII. *Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. Pushing the Limits*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations, **28** (2003) 1&2, 99–123.
- [Ivr1] V. IVRII. *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics*, Springer-Verlag, SMM, 1998, xv+731.
- [Ivr2] V. IVRII. Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. I. *Russian J. Math. Physics*, 4:1 (1996), 29-74.
- [Ivr3] V. IVRII. Asymptotics of the ground state energy of heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. II. *Russian J. Math. Physics*, 5:3 (1997), 321-354

- [Ivr4] V.IVRII. Heavy molecules in the strong magnetic field. *Russian J. Math. Physics*, **4** (1996), no 4, 449–456.
- [Ivr5] V.IVRII. Sharp Spectral Asymptotics for Operators with Irregular Coefficients. Pushing the Limits. II *Russian J. Math. Physics*, v. 28, no 1&2, pp. 125156, (2003).
- [Ivr6] V.IVRII. Semiclassical asymptotics for exchange energy, Séminaire sur les Équations aux Dérivées Partielles, 1993–1994, Exp. No. XX, 12 pp., cole Polytech., Palaiseau, 1994.
- [IS] V.IVRII, I.M.SIGAL. Asymptotics of the ground state energies of large Coulomb systems. *Ann. Math* **138** (1993), 243–335.

Department of Mathematics,
University of Toronto,
40 St.George Str.,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2E4
Canada
ivrii@math.toronto.edu
Fax: (416)978-4107